



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,529	02/18/2004	Abhishek Chauhan	2006579-0554 (CTX-161)	3237
69665 7590 12/19/2008 CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110				
EXAMINER CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2436				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/19/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/782,529

Applicant(s)

CHAUHAN ET AL.

Examiner

David García Cervetti

Art Unit

2436

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7-9, 17-19 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 5, 10, 11, 13-15, 20, 21, 25 and 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/3/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments filed December 3, 2008, have been fully considered.
 2. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-15, and 17-26 are pending and have been examined.
- Claims 6, 12, and 16 have been canceled.

Response to Amendment

3. Examiner understands that Applicant is not required to submit an explanation of relevance, however, Examiner still respectfully requests a brief explanation of relevance indicating the references to be of most significance.
4. Examiner withdraws the statement regarding the drawings depicted on fig. 1 and 2 being prior art.
5. The objection to the specification is withdrawn.
6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

7. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Information Disclosure Statement

8. **Applicant is reminded that an applicant's duty of disclosure of material and information is NOT satisfied by presenting a patent examiner with "a mountain of**

largely irrelevant [material] from with he is presumed to have been able, with his expertise and with adequate time, to have found the critical [material]. It ignores the real world conditions under which examiners work." Rohm & Haas Co. v. Crystal Chemical Co., 722 F.2d 1556, 1573 [220 USPQ 289] (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). (Emphasis in original). Patent applicant has a duty not just to disclose pertinent prior art references but to make a disclosure in such a way as not to "bury" it within other disclosures of less relevant prior art; See *Golden Valley Microwave Foods Inc. v. Weaver Popcorn Co. Inc.*, 24 USPQ2d 1801 (N.D. Ind. 1992); *Molins PLC v. Textron Inc.*, 26 USPQ2d 1889, at 1899 (D.Del. 1992); *Penn Yan Boats, Inc. v. Sea Lark Boats, Inc. et al.*, 175 USPQ 260, at 272 (S.D. Fl. 1972).

9. Eliminate clearly irrelevant and marginally pertinent cumulative information. If a long list is submitted, highlight those documents which have been specifically brought to applicant's attention and/or are known to be of most significance. See *Penn Yan Boats, Inc. v. Sea Lark Boats, Inc.*, 359 F.2d 948, 175 USPQ 260 (S.D. Fla. 1972), *aff'd*, 479 F.2d 1338, 178 USPQ 577 (5th Cir. 1973), cert. denied, 414 U.S. 874 (1974). But cf. *Molins PLC v. Textron Inc.*, 48 F.3d 1172, 33 USPQ2d 1823 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

10. Examiner has made a best effort to consider the large number of references submitted.

11. Please note due to the large number of references disclosed in the IDS (6/3/2008), applicant is requested to include a concise explanation of relevance indicating the references to be of most significance.

12. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

13. Claims 15 and 17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 15 and 17-26 are not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of applicant's disclosure, specification (page 25, par. 84), the system may be hardware or a combination of hardware and software, further, the module is still software. As such, the claims are not limited to statutory subject matter and are therefore non-statutory.

14. Amending the claims to expressly recite a hardware element, such as a processor and some storage element (i.e. memory) would overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

16. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 17-19, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodman et al. (US 7,272,853, hereinafter Goodman), and further in view of Abramson et al. (US 7,461, 336, hereinafter Abramson).

Regarding claims 1, 7, 17, and 22, Goodman teaches

a method of a device for filtering messages / Uniform Resource Locator (URL) routed across a network, the messages including field name-value pairs / URL components (abstract), the method comprising:

extracting, by a device, field name-value pairs / URL components from messages received via a network (col.6, lines 1-35); and

a message filter of the device, for generating a rule which would allow messages having values of a field name that match the most restrictive data type (col.4, lines 40-67).

Goodman teaches filtering by type, but does not expressly disclose, however, Abramson teaches

determining, by the device, a most restrictive data type of values from a plurality of data types of values for a field name of the extracted field name-value pairs (col.4, lines 1-30); and

storing, by the device, the most restrictive data type in association with the field name (col.4, lines 10-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use data types corresponding to fields or components as taught by Abramson with the system of Goodman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to filter out potentially harmful input (Abramson, col.3, lines 25-67).

Regarding claims 2, 8, 18, and 23, the combination of Goodman and Abramson teaches generating, by the device, a rule which would allow messages having values of a field name / the URL components that match the most restrictive data type (Goodman, col.4, lines 40-67).

Regarding claims 3, 9, 19, and 24, the combination of Goodman and Abramson teaches applying, by the device, the rule to determine whether to allow messages

Art Unit: 2436

having values for a field name / the URL components that match the most restrictive data type (Goodman, col.4, lines 40-67).

Allowable Subject Matter

17. Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 13-15, 20, 21, 25, and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID García CERVETTI whose telephone number is (571)272-5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and Thursday-Friday.

19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571)272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

20. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David García Cervetti/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2436